

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

I. SUMMARY

1. This is a civil rights action by plaintiff A. J. Oliver ("Oliver") for discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land, development, and/or surrounding business complex known as:

Longs Drugs Store #055 880 3rd Avenue Chula Vista, CA 91911 (hereafter "the Store")

2. Oliver seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs, against Longs Drug Stores California, Inc. dba Longs Drugs Store #055 and Longs Drug Store, Inc. (collectively "Longs Drugs Store") pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.), and related California statutes.

II. JURISDICTION

- 3. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA claims.
- 4. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law—arising from the same nucleus of operative facts—is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
 - 5. Oliver's claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

III. VENUE

6. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Southern District of California, and venue is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c).

IV. PARTIES

7. Longs Drugs Store owns, operates, or leases the Store, and consists of a person (or persons), firm(s), or corporation(s).

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

25

26

27

28

8. Oliver suffered a stroke approximately 13 years ago. The stroke left him paralyzed, speech impaired, and unable to stand or walk. Oliver requires the use of a motorized wheelchair when traveling about in public. Consequently, Oliver is "physically disabled," as defined by all applicable California and United States laws, and a member of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.

V. FACTS

- 9. The Store is a sales or retail establishment, open to the public, which is intended for nonresidential use and whose operation affects commerce.
- 10. Oliver visited the Store and encountered barriers (both physical and intangible) that interfered with—if not outright denied—his ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the facility. To the extent known by Oliver, the barriers at the Longs Drugs Store included, but are not limited to, the following:
 - All of the signage in the parking lot uses the term "handicapped;"
 - The tow away signage is not correct;
 - The ramp leading to the sidewalk encroaches into the access aisle causing the slope and cross slope of the aisle to be too steep;
 - There is no parking space designated as "van accessible;"
 - The ISA painted on the pavement in the accessible parking stalls is not the correct size;
 - The access aisles are not outlined in white, nor do they contain the painted words "NO PARKING;"
 - The International Symbol of Accessibility ("ISA") at the entrance is not mounted in the correct location, nor at the correct height;
 - There is no accessible check stand;
 - The restroom requires a key to access;
 - The restroom door requires too much force to operate;

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

- 2
- 3
- 5
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 1213
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 2021
- 22
- 2324
- 25
- 2627
- 28

- The restroom door requires twisting and grasping to open;
- The side grab bar is not 12 inches from the back wall;
- The disposable seat cover dispenser is mounted more than 40 inches from the floor;
- The disposable seat cover dispenser is mounted over the back grab bar, causing it to be out of the required reach ranges;
- The toilet tissue dispenser protrudes into the clear floor space needed at the water closet;
- The pipes underneath the lavatory are not completely wrapped to prevent burns;
- The trash receptacle encroaches into the clear floor space needed at the lavatory;
- The controls on the lavatory require twisting and grasping to operate;
- The mirror is mounted more than 40 inches from the floor;
- The operable part of the soap dispenser is mounted more than 40 inches from the floor;
- The lavatory encroaches into the clear floor space needed to access the paper towel dispenser; and,
- The operable part of the paper towel dispenser is mounted more than 40 inches from the floor.

These barriers prevented Oliver from enjoying full and equal access.

11. Oliver was also deterred from visiting the Store because he knew that the Store's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations were unavailable to physically disabled patrons (such as himself). He continues to be deterred from visiting the Store because of the future threats of injury created by these barriers.

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

- 12. Oliver also encountered barriers at the Store, which violate state and federal law, but were unrelated to his disability. Nothing within this Complaint, however, should be construed as an allegation that Oliver is seeking to remove barriers unrelated to his disability.
- 13. Longs Drugs Store knew that these elements and areas of the Store were inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to the physically disabled. Moreover, Longs Drugs Store has the financial resources to remove these barriers from the Store (without much difficulty or expense), and make the facility accessible to the physically disabled. To date, however, Longs Drugs Store refuses to either remove those barriers or seek an unreasonable hardship exemption to excuse non-compliance.
- 14. At all relevant times, Longs Drugs Store has possessed and enjoyed sufficient control and authority to modify the subject property to remove impediments to wheelchair access and to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines and Title 24 regulations. Longs Drugs Store has not removed such impediments and has not modified the subject property to conform to accessibility standards. Longs Drugs Store has intentionally maintained the subject property in its current condition and has intentionally refrained from altering the subject property so that it complies with the accessibility standards.
- 15. Oliver further alleges that the (continued) presence of barriers at the facility is so obvious as to establish Longs Drugs Store's discriminatory intent. On information and belief, Oliver avers that evidence of this discriminatory intent includes Longs Drugs Store's refusal to adhere to relevant building standards; disregard for the building plans and permits issued for the facility; conscientious decision to the architectural layout (as it currently exists)

E.g., Gunther v.Lin, 144 Cal.App.4th 223, fn. 6
Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store
Plaintiff's Complaint

at the facility; decision not to remove barriers from the facility; and allowance that Longs Drugs Store's property continues to exist in its non-compliant state. Oliver further alleges, on information and belief, that Longs Drugs Store are not in the midst of a remodel, and that the barriers present at the facility is not isolated (or temporary) interruptions in access due to maintenance or repairs.²

VI. FIRST CLAIM

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

Denial of "Full and Equal" Enjoyment and Use

- 16. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 15 for this claim.
- 17. Title III of the ADA holds as a "general rule" that no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use) of goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
- 18. Longs Drugs Store discriminated against Oliver by denying "full and equal enjoyment" and use of the goods, services, facilities, privileges or accommodations of the Store during each visit and each incident of deterrence.

Failure to Remove Architectural Barriers in an Existing Facility

- 19. The ADA specifically prohibits failing to remove architectural barriers, which are structural in nature, in existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). The term "readily achievable" is defined as "easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense." <u>Id.</u> § 12181(9).
- 20. When an entity can demonstrate that removal of a barrier is not readily achievable, a failure to make goods, services, facilities, or

Id.; 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(b)

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store

Plaintiff's Complaint

7

10

1213

14

15

16

17

1819

2021

2223

2425

26

2728

accommodations available through alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these methods are readily achievable. Id. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).

- 21. Here, Oliver alleges that Longs Drugs Store can easily remove the architectural barriers at the Store without much difficulty or expense, and that Longs Drugs Store violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it was readily achievable to do so.
- 22. In the alternative, if it was not "readily achievable" for Longs Drugs Store to remove the Store's barriers, then Longs Drugs Store violated the ADA by failing to make the required services available through alternative methods, which are readily achievable.

Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

- 23. On information and belief, the Store was designed or constructed (or both) after January 26, 1992—independently triggering access requirements under Title III of the ADA.
- 24. The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first occupancy after January 26, 1993, that aren't readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).
- 25. Here, Longs Drugs Store violated the ADA by designing or constructing (or both) the Store in a manner that was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public—including Oliver—when it was structurally practical to do so.³

Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

26. On information and belief, the Store was modified after January 26, 1992, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.

Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that plaintiff is bringing this action as a private attorney general under either state or federal statutes.

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

20

23

22

24 25

26

///

///

27

28

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

- 27. The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects (or could affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with disabilities to the maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an area that contains a facility's primary function also requires adding making the paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving that area accessible to the maximum extent feasible. Id.
- 28. Here, Longs Drugs Store altered the Store in a manner that violated the ADA and was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public including Oliver—to the maximum extent feasible.

Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

- 29. The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- Here, Longs Drugs Store violated the ADA by failing to make 30. reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures at the Store, when these modifications were necessary to afford (and would not fundamentally alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or accommodations.
- Oliver seeks all relief available under the ADA (i.e., injunctive 31. relief, attorney fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C. § 12205.
- Oliver also seeks a finding from this Court (i.e., declaratory relief) 32. that Longs Drugs Store violated the ADA in order to pursue damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act or Disabled Persons Act.

2

Disabled Persons Act

3 4

5

through 30 for this claim.

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14 15

17 18

16

19

21

20

23

22

24 25 26

27 28 33. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1

VII. SECOND CLAIM

- 34. California Civil Code § 54 states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities have the same right as the general public to the full and free use of the streets, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings and facilities, and other public places.
- 35. California Civil Code § 54.1 also states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access to accommodations, facilities, telephone facilities, places of public accommodation, and other places to which the general public is invited.
- 36. Both specifically sections incorporate (by reference) individual's rights under the ADA. See Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d).
- Here, Longs Drugs Store discriminated against the physically 37. disabled public—including Oliver—by denying them full and equal access to the Store. Longs Drugs Store also violated Oliver's rights under the ADA, and, therefore, infringed upon or violated (or both) Oliver's rights under the Disabled Persons Act.
- 38. For each offense of the Disabled Persons Act, Oliver seeks actual damages (both general and special damages), statutory minimum damages of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), declaratory relief, and any other remedy available under California Civil Code § 54.3.
- 39. He also seeks to enjoin Longs Drugs Store from violating the Disabled Persons Act (and ADA) under California Civil Code § 55, and to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and incurred under California Civil Code §§ 54.3 and 55.

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

VIII. THIRD CLAIM

Unruh Civil Rights Act

- 40. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 30 for this claim.
- 41. California Civil Code § 51 states, in part, that: All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.
- 42. California Civil Code § 51.5 also states, in part, that: No business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against any person in this state because of the disability of the person.
- California Civil Code § 51(f) specifically incorporates (by 43. reference) an individual's rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.
- Longs Drugs Store's aforementioned acts and omissions denied the physically disabled public—including Oliver—full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges and services in a business establishment (because of their physical disability).
- 45. These acts and omissions (including the ones that violate the ADA) denied, aided or incited a denial, or discriminated against Oliver by violating the Unruh Act.
- Oliver was damaged by Longs Drugs Store's wrongful conduct, and 46. seeks statutory minimum damages of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for each offense.
- 47. Oliver also seeks to enjoin Longs Drugs Store from violating the Unruh Act (and ADA), and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred under California Civil Code § 52(a).

/// 28 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

IX. FOURTH CLAIM

Denial of Full and Equal Access to Public Facilities

- 48. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 for this claim.
- 49. Health and Safety Code § 19955(a) states, in part, that: California public accommodations or facilities (built with private funds) shall adhere to the provisions of Government Code § 4450.
- 50. Health and Safety Code § 19959 states, in part, that: Every existing (non-exempt) public accommodation constructed prior to July 1, 1970, which is altered or structurally repaired, is required to comply with this chapter.
- 51. Oliver alleges the Store is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code § 4450 (or both), and that the Store was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.
- 52. Longs Drugs Store's non-compliance with these requirements at the Store aggrieved (or potentially aggrieved) Oliver and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly, he seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.

X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Oliver prays judgment against Longs Drugs Store for:

- 1. Injunctive relief, preventive relief, or any other relief the Court deems proper.
- 2. Declaratory relief that Longs Drugs Store violated the ADA for the purposes of Unruh Act or Disabled Persons Act damages.
- 3. Statutory minimum damages under either sections 52(a) or 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code (but not both) according to proof.

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store Plaintiff's Complaint

Document 1 Filed 12/07/2007

Page 12 of 14

Case 3:07-cv-02302-IEG-BLM

This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

Oliver v. Longs Drugs Store

Plaintiff's Complaint

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

*

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by how except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the even docket sheet. (BEE 114	STREETIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORMA			07 070	7 DM 0. L.E
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	リノ ひとし 一	/ FII 3: 40
A.J. OLIVER			LONGS DRUG S	TODES CALIEODNIA	INC. dhodoMAS
A.J. OLIVER			LONGS DRUG STORES CALLEORNIA ENGLOPMOS DRUGS STORE #055; LONGSEDRUGISTORE, CANCIORNIA		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff SAN DIEGO			County of Residence of	f First Listed Defendant	10001/
• •	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY) DEPUTY
(22			NOTE: IN LAND	CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SETHELOCATION OF THE
	·			NVOLVED.	THE LOCATION OF THE
					_
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)	700 0 = 0 -	TEO LOUA
LAW OFFICES OF LYNN HUBBARD (530) 895-3252			U		(BLM)
12 WILLIAMSBURG LA			ļ		
-				DILLOTE LA DAMES	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government	☑ 3 Federal Question	'	(For Diversity Cases Only)	re DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize		1 🗇 l Incorporated or Pr	
				of Business In Thi	s State
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Cision	en of Another State	2	Principal Place
Defendant	·	Citiz	en of Another State	of Business In	
2010.13411	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				
	·			3	
TEL - BLAMFING ON CHIE		<u>Fo</u>	oreign Country		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT: FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES					
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury		610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice		625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 365 Personal Injury	.	of Property 21 USC 881		☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability		630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 368 Asbestos Persons 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product		640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs.	820 Copyrights 830 Patent	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
151 Medicare Act	Liability Liability		660 Occupational	840 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER	TY	Safety/Health		490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud		690 Other	COCYLE ON OUR INTE	810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 371 Truth in Lending 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal		LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	875 Customer Challenge
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability 385 Property Damage	. 07	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability	10.3	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	NS: IT :	& Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	892 Economic Stabilization Act
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca		790 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	B93 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure	☐ 442 Employment Sentence		791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:		Security Act	871 IRS—Third Party	895 Freedom of Information
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General 535 Death Penalty			26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Ot	her			Under Equal Access
	Employment				to Justice
	■ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - □ 555 Prison Condition	١			950 Constitutionality of
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights				State Statutes
	- 440 Other Civil Rights			<u></u>	-L
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)		***		Appeal to District
🗷 1 Original 🗖 2 F	Removed from 3 Remanded from	J 4 Rei		ferred from	rict 7 Judge from Magistrate
	State Court Appellate Court	Reo	nened (spec	ify) Litigation	n Judgment
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 42 U.S.C. Section 12101, et sec	re filing	(Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION		<u>1· </u>			
THE CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cause: Ongoing violations of the ADA Co	netructi	on Standards		
THE DECISIONS TO				OUTON VICE - 1	if damandad in carrelaint
VII. REQUESTED IN			DEMAND \$	•	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	E	Excess of \$75,000	JURY DEMAND	: Yes ZINo
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S)				•
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER E	xcess of \$75.000
					·····
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNE	OF RECORD		
12/06/2007					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			7		
- 01			•		
RECEIPT # 145 281	AMOUNT 350 APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE
112000					
17/7/2	\mathcal{M}				
ior itoil					

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

145289 - SR * * C O P Y * * December 07, 2007 16:04:10

Civ Fil Non-Pris

USA0 #.: 07CV2302 CIV. FIL. Judge..: IRMA E GONZALEZ

\$350.00 CK Amount.:

Check#.: BC#20521

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: OLIVER V. LONGS DRUGS

CIVIL FILING